



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,627	01/09/2002	Xiao-Tao Chen	PH-7211	6514

23914 7590 08/20/2003

STEPHEN B. DAVIS
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 4000
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

EXAMINER

LIU, HONG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

10/043,627

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hong Liu

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants' election of Group I subject matter along with species of Example #8 with traverse in Paper No. 8 is noted but is not found persuasive for the following reasons. Restriction is proper when there is a lack of unity of invention and such is not affected by the manner of claiming-i.e. in separate claims or within a single claim. As stated in the previous action the resultant compounds embraced by Z^a constitute structurally dissimilar compounds. Placing all such compounds into the same claim is repugnant to scientific classification as they are separately classified and require separate literature searches. As indicated in the previous office action, each of the groups belongs to a separate class and numerous subclasses. To search all the patents under these classes and subclasses would place a substantial burden on the examiner, let alone search of other non-patent literature. Having a common utility among the groups is not enough where as herein there is not a substantial structure feature common to all groups. They are made and used independently of each other, are not art-recognized equivalents.

In regards to the separation of compound groups from method of use groups, MPEP. 806.05(h) permits restriction when more than one use can be shown exists for the compounds claimed. In the instant case uses such as treating stroke, anorexia, asthma, HIV infection, etc., as alleged by applicants are distinct uses irrespective of the mode(s) of action being relied on to treat the disorders. Thus, the restriction is fully in compliance with the guideline of MPEP 806.05(f).

For the above reasons, the restriction is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Art Unit: 1624

1. Claims 7-10 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are objected to as being an improper Markush grouping. The recited compounds, while possessing a common utility, present a variable core and, thus, the Markush groups represented by the term where Z^a is quinoline and where Z^a is other than quinoline have variably different definitions, render the claims clearly improper.

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for preparation of compounds wherein Z^a is quinoline, Z is aryl, and ring B is a five or six membered, monocyclic, saturated heterocyclic ring, R^{1a} and R^{1b} , R^a and R^{a1} , two R^3 do not form a ring, does not reasonably provide enablement for preparation and use of compounds wherein Z^a , and B are functional groups other than the above specified functional groups. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1624

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The nature of the invention in the instant application has claims which embrace a diversity of chemically and physically distinct compounds, wherein Z and ring B can be an unsubstituted or substituted, aromatic or an unsubstituted or substituted, heteroaromatic group, containing one or more heteroatoms, etc. While many compounds are disclosed, there is insufficient guidance for preparing additional "matrix metalloprotease antagonists" which would be effective since the cited examples are drawn to a homogenous group of compounds not remotely commensurate in scope to applicants' claims. Only compounds wherein Z^a is quinoline and ring B is a five or six membered, monocyclic, saturated heterocyclic ring have been made. Although the synthesis scheme shows that the compounds can be prepared by reacting intermediate 2 or a spirolactone 6 with HS-Z-U^a-X^a-Y^a-Z^a to obtain the final products (pages 40 and 41), there is no teaching in the following examples how the starting materials of HS-Z-U^a-X^a-Y^a-Z^a can be obtained wherein U^a is absent or other than an oxygen and R^{1a} and R^{1b}, R^a and R^{a1}, two R³ form rings.

Furthermore, testing data is limited to a number of compounds not considered to be representative of all the possible compounds encompassed by the claims. Examples should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claim. However, the generic claims are much broader in scope than is represented by the testing. The definitions of the various R variables embrace many structurally divergent groups not represented at all in testing, since testing for the instant compounds is not seen in the specification. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure when the "working examples" fail to include written description(s)

Art Unit: 1624

which teach how to make and use Markush members embraced thereby in full, clear and exact terms. See *In re Fouch*, 169 USPQ 429.

This area of activity can be expected to be highly structure specific and unpredictable, as is generally true for chemically-based pharmacological activity. In view of the structural divergence in the claims, one skilled in the art could not reasonably extrapolate the activities of some of the claimed compounds to the other structurally divergent compounds embraced by the claims which have not been tested. In cases directed to chemical compounds which are being used for their physiological activity, the scope of the claims must have a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification. See *In re Surrey* 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. No reasonable assurance has been made that the instant compounds as an entire class have the required activities needed to practice the invention. Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability" have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the scope being claimed.

^

^

^

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. None of the prior art of record nor a search in the pertinent art area teaches the exact species of the claims.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Liu whose telephone number is 703 3065814. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 703 308 4716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 308-4556 for regular communications and 703 3084734 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 358-1235.



Mukund Shah
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1624

hl
August 15, 2003

11

11